



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,941	02/24/2004	Daniel Manhung Wong	50277-2406	3803
43425 7590 07/21/2010 HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1083				
EXAMINER				
PHAM, MICHAEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/21/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/786,941

**Applicant(s)**

WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG

**Examiner**

MICHAEL PHAM

**Art Unit**

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Status*

1. Claims 1-26 are pending and have been examined.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant's amended claims state "wherein said tag is not embedded in said database statement"; however there is no clear support from the specifications of this specific limitation and is contradictory of what is stated in the specifications. The specification paragraph 0025 as published (US20050187958) states the opposite of what is claimed, stating that the "tag 103b includes control information such as information related to priority, quality of service, user identification, security, and/or user supplied routines that is appended to, attached, sent with, **embedded in**, or otherwise associated with database statement 102a".
4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Prior 112 second paragraph rejection directed towards claims 1 and 14 are withdrawn.
6. Claims 4-6, 17-18, and 26 all recites the limitation "the at least one parameter " in for example, line 2 of claim 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

7. Regarding claims 14-26, these claims recite a "non-transitory machine-readable storage medium". In the absence of any other modifying disclosure of this limitation in the specification, the ' non-transitory machine-readable storage medium' is limited to statutory embodiments only such that it satisfies the terms of 35 U.S.C. 101.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**9. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 14-21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 20050050046 by Puz et. al. (hereafter Puz).**

**Claim 1 :**

Puz discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a database server receiving a request to execute the database statement, wherein the request includes the database statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language of said database statement, wherein said tag is not embedded in said database statement;”[See figure 2. Accordingly, a database server (figure 2, element 16) receiving a request (figure 2 elements 34, 36, 38) to execute the database statement (figure 2 elements 40, 42, 44), wherein the request (figure 2 elements 34, 36, 38) includes the database statement (figure 2 elements 40, 42, 44) and a tag (figure 2 elements 46, 48, 50) that does not conform to a database language of said database statement (figure 2, security markers not sql), wherein said tag (figure 2 element 46, 48, and 50) is not embedded in said database statement (figure 2, SQL part and security marker)]

“wherein said tag specifies at least one parameter field and at least one parameter value;”[figure 2 elements 46, 48, 50. Accordingly, wherein said tag (46, 48, 50) specifies at least one parameter field (marker 1, 2, 3) and at least one parameter value (employee\_3, journal\_1, none)]

“in response to receiving the request, said database server storing information from the tag in a manner that is associated with said database statement and accessible to a tag access mechanism;”[figure 2 and figure 3. Accordingly, in response to receiving the request

(figure 2 elements 34, 36, 38), said database server (figure 2 element 16) storing information from the tag (figure 2 element 46, 48, 50) in a manner that is associated with said database statement (figure 2 element 40, 42, 44) and accessible to a tag access mechanism (0030, Access Control List checks)]

“said database server executing said database statement, wherein during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter value through said tag access mechanism provided by said database server.”[figure 2 and 4. Accordingly, said database server executing said database statement (figure 4 elements 82-86), wherein during execution of said database statement (figure 4 elements 82-86) said database server (figure 2 element 16) provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter value (figure 4 element 82, a marker part to a server system for processing) through said tag access mechanism (figure 4 element 84, ACL checks on the markers) provided by said database server (figure 2 element 16)]

**Claim 2 :**

Puz discloses “wherein the database statement is written in a language in which results desired are specified by the database statement, and no procedures for obtaining the results desired are specified by the database statement.”[ Figure 2 and 0029-0030. Accordingly, wherein the database statement is written in a language in which results desired are specified by the database statement (SQL part), and no procedures (SQL part does not contain security marker) for obtaining the results desired are specified by the database statement (SQL part)]

**Claim 3 :**

Puz discloses “wherein a priority for executing the database statement is determined based on the at least one parameter value.”[ Figure 2. 0027, proper access permissions. Accordingly, wherein a priority (proper access permissions) for executing the database statement (SQL) is determined based on the at least one parameter value (security marker)]

**Claim 4 :**

Puz discloses “wherein a security level is associated with the at least one parameter such that whether the database is entitled to access a component is based on the at least one parameter.”[ Figure 2. 0027, proper access permissions. Accordingly, wherein a security level (proper access permissions) is associated with the at least one parameter (security marker) such that whether the database is entitled to access a component is based on the at least one parameter (access permissions)]

**Claim 6 :**

Puz discloses “wherein the at least one parameter is related to user context information.”[figure 2. 0027, user had proper access permission. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter (figure 2 element 46, 48, 50) is related to user context information (user had proper access permission)]

**Claim 7 :**

Puz discloses “wherein the tag comprises an indicator of a beginning of the tag, and an indicator of an end of the tag “ [See figure 2 and figure 3. Accordingly, wherein the tag (figure 2 elements 46, 48, 50) comprises an indicator of a beginning of the tag (figure 3, “(“ ), and an indicator of an end of the tag (figure 3, “)” )]

**Claim 8 :**

Puz discloses “wherein the at least one parameter value is located between the indicator of the beginning and the indicator of the end of the tag.”[ figure 3. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value (figure 3 element 62, select ) is located between the indicator of the beginning (figure 3 element 62, “(“ and the indicator of the end of the tag (figure 3 element 62 “)”)]]

**Claim 9 :**

Puz discloses “wherein each of the at least one parameter fields comprises an indicator of a beginning of the parameter field, followed by the parameter value, which in turn is followed by an indicator of an end of the parameter field.”[ Figure 3. Accordingly, wherein each of the at least one parameter fields (figure 3 element 62, exists) comprises an indicator of a beginning of the parameter field (figure 3 element 62 “(“ ), followed by the parameter value (figure 3 element 62, select), which in turn is followed by an indicator of an end of the parameter field (figure 3 element 62, “)”).]

**Claim 14 :**

Puz discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a database server receiving a request to execute the database statement, wherein the request includes the database statement and a tag that does not conform to a database language of said database statement, wherein said tag is not embedded in said database statement;”[See figure 2. Accordingly, a database server (figure 2, element 16) receiving a request (figure 2 elements 34, 36, 38) to execute the database statement (figure 2 elements 40, 42, 44), wherein the request (figure 2 elements 34, 36, 38) includes the database statement (figure 2 elements 40, 42, 44) and a tag (figure 2 elements 46, 48, 50) that does not conform to a database language of



said database statement (figure 2, security markers not sql), wherein said tag (figure 2 element 46, 48, and 50) is not embedded in said database statement (figure 2, SQL part and security marker)]

“wherein said tag specifies at least one parameter field and at least one parameter value;”[figure 2 elements 46, 48, 50. Accordingly, wherein said tag (46, 48, 50) specifies at least one parameter field (marker 1, 2, 3) and at least one parameter value (employee\_3, journal\_1, none)]

“in response to receiving the request, said database server storing information from the tag in a manner that is associated with said database statement and accessible to a tag access mechanism;”[figure 2 and figure 3. Accordingly, in response to receiving the request (figure 2 elements 34, 36, 38), said database server (figure 2 element 16) storing information from the tag (figure 2 element 46, 48, 50) in a manner that is associated with said database statement (figure 2 element 40, 42, 44) and accessible to a tag access mechanism (0030, Access Control List checks)]

“said database server executing said database statement, wherein during execution of said database statement said database server provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter value through said tag access mechanism provided by said database server.”[figure 2 and 4. Accordingly, said database server executing said database statement (figure 4 elements 82-86), wherein during execution of said database statement (figure 4 elements 82-86) said database server (figure 2 element 16) provides access to one or more of the at least one parameter value (figure 4 element 82, a marker part to a server system for processing) through

said tag access mechanism (figure 4 element 84, ACL checks on the markers) provided by said database server (figure 2 element 16)]

**Claim 15 :**

Puz discloses “wherein the database statement is written in a language in which results desired are specified by the database statement, but no procedures for obtaining the results desired are specified by the database statement.”[ Figure 2 and 0029-0030. Accordingly, wherein the database statement is written in a language in which results desired are specified by the database statement (SQL part), but no procedures (SQL part does not contain security marker) for obtaining the results desired are specified by the database statement (SQL part)]

**Claim 16 :**

Puz discloses “wherein a priority for executing the database statement is determined based on the at least one parameter value.”[ Figure 2. 0027, proper access permissions. Accordingly, wherein a priority (proper access permissions) for executing the database statement (SQL) is determined based on the at least one parameter value (security marker)]

**Claim 18 :**

Puz discloses “wherein the at least one parameter is related to user context information.”[figure 2. 0027, user had proper access permission. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter (figure 2 element 46, 48, 50) is related to user context information (user had proper access permission)]

**Claim 19 :**

Puz discloses “wherein the tag comprises an indicator of a beginning of the tag, and an indicator of an end of the tag “ [See figure 2 and figure 3. Accordingly, wherein the tag (figure 2 elements

46, 48, 50) comprises an indicator of a beginning of the tag (figure 3, “(“ ), and an indicator of an end of the tag (figure 3, “)” )]

**Claim 20 :**

Puz discloses “wherein the at least one parameter value is located between the indicator of the beginning and the indicator of the end of the tag.”[ figure 3. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value (figure 3 element 62, select ) is located between the indicator of the beginning (figure 3 element 62, “(“ ) and the indicator of the end of the tag (figure 3 element 62 “)”)]

**Claim 21 :**

Puz discloses “wherein each of the at least one parameter fields comprises an indicator of a beginning of the parameter field, followed by the parameter value, which in turn is followed by an indicator of an end of the parameter field.”[ Figure 3. Accordingly, wherein each of the at least one parameter fields (figure 3 element 62, exists) comprises an indicator of a beginning of the parameter field (figure 3 element 62 “(“ ), followed by the parameter value (figure 3 element 62, select), which in turn is followed by an indicator of an end of the parameter field (figure 3 element 62, “)” ).]

**Claim 26 :**

Puz discloses “wherein a security level is associated with the at least one parameter such that whether the database is entitled to access a component is based on the at least one parameter.”[ Figure 2. 0027, proper access permissions. Accordingly, wherein a security level (proper access permissions) is associated with the at least one parameter (security marker) such

that whether the database is entitled to access a component is based on the at least one parameter (access permissions)]

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

**10.** The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**11. Claims 5, 11-13, and 22-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 20050050046 by Puz et. al. (hereafter Puz) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 20030014394 by Fujiwara et. al. (hereafter Fujiwara).**

**Claim 5 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose “wherein the at least one parameter is accessible to a systems administrator” On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses “wherein the at least one parameter is accessible to a systems administrator. “[figure 8 and 0044, administrator]. Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara’s disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 10 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session”. On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session” [figure 12.

Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value (figure 12 element 1202, c.pt\_ID, i.vst) can be accessed without accessing a session space (figure 12 element 1224, filter MD()) associated with a session window (figure 12 element 702), wherein the database statement (figure 12 element 1202) was issued within the session window (figure 12 element 702)]. Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara’s disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 11 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session.” On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session.” [figure 12. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value (Figure 12 element 1202, example.. c.PT\_ID, i.VST) can be accessed (Figure 12, element 1202, Issue SQL query) without accessing

memory allocated to a database session (figure 12 element 702), wherein the database statement was issued (figure 12 element 734, issued SQL query) within the database session (Figure 12 element 734, Report templates)] Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara's disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 12 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose "wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session.". On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses "wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session." [figure 12. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value (Figure 12 element 1202, example.. c.PT\_ID, i.VST) can be accessed (Figure 12, element 1202, Issue SQL query) without accessing memory allocated to a database session (figure 12 element 702), wherein the database statement was issued (figure 12 element 734, issued SQL query) within the database session (Figure 12 element 734, Report templates)] Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara's disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be

determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 13 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed after a session window has closed, wherein the database statement was issued within the session window.” On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed after a session window has closed, wherein the database statement was issued within the session window.” [figure 12. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed (figure 12 element 1202, c.PT\_ID, i.VST) after a session window has closed (figure 12 element 734), wherein the database statement was issued within the session window (figure 12 element 734 and 1202)] Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara’s disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 17 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose “wherein the at least one parameter is accessible to a systems administrator” On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses “wherein the at least one parameter is accessible to a systems administrator. “[figure 8 and 0044, administrator]. Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara’s disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the

purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 22 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session”. On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session”[figure 12.

Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value (figure 12 element 1202, c.pt\_ID, i.vst) can be accessed without accessing a session space (figure 12 element 1224, filter MD()) associated with a session window (figure 12 element 702), wherein the database statement (figure 12 element 1202) was issued within the session window (figure 12 element 702)]. Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara’s disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 23 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session.” On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database



session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session.” [figure 12. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value (Figure 12 element 1202, example.. c.PT\_ID, i.VST) can be accessed (Figure 12, element 1202, Issue SQL query) without accessing memory allocated to a database session (figure 12 element 702), wherein the database statement was issued (figure 12 element 734, issued SQL query)within the database session (Figure 12 element 734, Report templates)] Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara’s disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 24 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session.”. On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses “wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed without accessing memory allocated to a database session, wherein the database statement was issued within the database session.” [figure 12. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value (Figure 12 element 1202, example.. c.PT\_ID, i.VST) can be accessed (Figure 12, element 1202, Issue SQL query) without accessing memory allocated to a database session (figure 12 element 702), wherein the database statement was issued (figure 12 element 734, issued SQL query)within the database session (Figure 12 element 734, Report templates)] Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a

person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara's disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

**Claim 25 :**

Puz does not explicitly disclose "wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed after a session window has closed, wherein the database statement was issued within the session window." On the other hand, Fujiwara further discloses "wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed after a session window has closed, wherein the database statement was issued within the session window." [figure 12. Accordingly, wherein the at least one parameter value can be accessed (figure 12 element 1202, c.PT\_ID, i.VST) after a session window has closed (figure 12 element 734), wherein the database statement was issued within the session window (figure 12 element 734 and 1202)] Both Puz and Fujiwara are within the same field of endeavor as they are both access control systems for a database query. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Fujiwara's disclosure above to the disclosure of Puz for the purpose of allowing an access policy to be determined in order to provide for easier management of access control to each user.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record listed on pto-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. P./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/John R. Cottingham/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2167